

SAN DIEGO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSALS (RFQ/P)
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING SERVICES FOR THE BROWNFIELDS ASSESSMENT PROJECT

INFORMATION PROVIDED BY THE AGENCY IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED VIA E-MAIL

Questions and Answers prepared January 31, 2011

Continued from Questions and Answers prepared January 25, 2011

- Q8.** *In regards to item VII, vii, Schedule of Rates on page 9 of the RFQ/P, are teams required to submit all inclusive and detailed cost estimates for the scope of work with estimates for labor, subcontractors, vendors, supplies and other direct costs? This is challenging as, for example, the scope of work for Phase II investigations is as yet undefined, but could be estimated based on a set of assumptions. Or is the Agency just asking for rates?*

The Agency is asking for: (1) hourly labor rates for key personnel (with labor rates' ranges for other personnel as acceptable); (2) project specific fee schedule; and, (3) identification of any other fees and expenses that may accrue and are NOT included in the personnel rates.

For the project-specific fee schedule, respondents may choose to submit a schedule that is focused on key tasks (inclusive of time and materials) which include: (1) specific project **tasks** which may depart from the **Budget Summary** and their associated budget as described in the Work Plan (Attachment 1); **AND**, (2) the scope of the work that is generally expected from consultants as noted in the RFQ/P.

- Q9.** *Do the task budgets in Attachment 1 reflect the entire project budget, which would include the Agency's costs, or are these solely the anticipated consultant costs for the specific scope of work presented in Section IV of the RFQ/P?*

No. The budget summary shown on the Work Plan (Attachment 1) may not reflect the entire nor accurate project budget as said document was prepared by Agency's staff early in the conception of this project, without the benefit of input from qualified consultants and/or detailed knowledge about the project (see further details above).

- Q10.** *What specific tasks related to community outreach would be required of the consultant firm? The scope of work outlined on page 6 of the RFQ/P specifies involvement with the preparation of fact sheets, presentations and similar documents for stakeholders; assistance with providing opportunities for public input; and assistance refining and implementing the program. How many outreach meetings does the Agency anticipate? Would the consultant participate in all meetings? Will the consultant be leading any meetings?*

Community outreach inclusive of community meetings and preparation of documents (including fact sheets and presentations) would consist of a cooperative effort between Agency staff,

project partners and consultant(s) of work. Respondents may want to identify community outreach as a line item in the budget and describe what this work may include. A budget for meetings (inclusive of community meetings) may be presented as part of a different line item along with an identification of staff that may be present at public forums and their role.

- Q11.** *Under Task 1, Project Management and Planning, the Agency lists a total budget of \$12,000. It is a bit unclear as to the consultant's role in regards to travel to national and regional EPA conferences and items that have already been completed to date (i.e. preparation of the RFP). Should the consultant in our fee planning account for a portion of the \$12,000 budget to be utilized by Agency personnel for these tasks as well as time to contract with the selected consultant, training opportunities, etc...? This is also unclear as during the pre-submittal meeting the Agency indicated that travel costs were not reimbursable under the Grant program. This question also applies to Task 2 – Community Outreach as it is a bit unclear if we should be allotting a portion of the Grant Funds for the Agency.*

Consultant(s) of work will not be asked to complete any work related to the travel expenses that are reimbursable under the grant provisions. Respondents should NOT allocate any expenses from the grant funds to portions of the grant elements that may be completed by Agency staff and/or its partners at this point. Please note that when Agency staff referred to the fact that travel expenses are not reimbursable (at the pre-submittal meeting), this was in reference to those expenses incurred by the consultant(s) of work (including mileage) in completing any of the portions of the work that they have been procured to deliver (such as travel to attend public meetings, reach a site where work needs to be conducted and/or meet with regulators or Agency staff).

- Q12.** During the pre-submittal meeting last week, the Agency indicated that the administrative costs associated with implementing this program will be absorbed by the City independent of the Grant Funds. In our fee planning for this submittal, should we plan on allotting any portion of the grant funds for Agency involvement with the management and required EPA submittals associated with the Fund. With the past grants that we've managed there is almost always a portion of the grants held aside for Agency administrative costs, etc.

Agency staff indicated that some of the administrative functions that Agency staff (and/or its partners will need to complete as part of this grant) will NOT be absorbed by grant funds but rather through Agency funds and those of project partners. All services to be provided by consultants procured as part of this RFQ/P are anticipated to be reimbursable through the EPA grant funds provided these conform to the grant criteria.

- Q13.** *Which environmental consulting firm assisted with preparation of the Brownfields Assessment Project Work Plan, and is that firm excluded from being considered for this contract?*

No private firm assisted. Agency staff prepared the subject Plan staff with no technical support from consultants.

- Q14.** *Can you please clarify the location of the Public Agency Certified Firm Directory referenced as item number 1 on Page 14 of the RFQP? It is not apparent on the CCDC website.*

Please reference,

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/find_certified.htm, and you may want to refer to,
<http://www.sandiego.gov/purchasing/consultants/services/rotation.shtml>

- Q15.** *The Work Plan indicates that “ASTM” Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) should be conducted. Can you clarify whether the Phase II ESAs should be done to an ASTM standard or in accordance with the current County of San Diego Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) guidelines?*

Phase II Environmental Site Assessments should be conducted in accordance with County of San Diego Site Assessment and Mitigation Guidelines as well as any current ASTM Phase II standards to the extent those are applicable to the proposed investigation.

- Q16.** *It is understood from Task 7 of the Work Plan that the project partners intend to prepare a minimum of 3 remediation plans and enroll in the County of San Diego’s Voluntary Assistance Program. In the event that evidence of an unauthorized release (e.g., from an underground storage tank) is detected during Phase II ESA activities, can you clarify the consultant’s responsibilities and anticipated level of effort for coordinating with regulatory agencies and providing documentation and technical support? Would unauthorized release reporting, coordination, and documentation be considered separate from the tasks listed in the Work Plan?*

No such minimum – see other related responses (generally the Work Plan is considered a fluid document at this time as will be amended as needed as the project progresses as it was prepared during a very early phase of this project). Additionally, for the purposes of the RFQ/P, please presume that the consultant will not be required to do any work beyond the preparation of a remediation plan which allows the Agency to enroll in the County of San Diego’s Voluntary Assistance Program.

- Q17.** *To what extent will the EPA review/approve deliverables/documents - Site inventory, Phase I reports, Work Plans, Phase 2 reports, risk assessments, RAPs, Completion reports (do we expect a formal Draft, comments, RTC, final, etc), in addition to review/approval by Agency staff?*

For the purposes of this RFQ/P, please assume that all draft documents will require Agency staff and EPA staff. Agency staff review will focus on completeness, accuracy and legal matters. EPA staff will focus on the grant parameters and any applicable regulatory framework -both of which Agency staff would consider into the preparation of the initial draft in consultation with the consultant(s) of work.

- Q18.** *The RFQ/P references the term “sub-consultant” and indicates that sub-consultant information must be provided in several sections of the submittal (e.g., cover letter, list of project personnel, organizational chart, qualifications/experience, “other information”). Does the Agency distinguish between sub-consultants providing professional services and those considered more*

of a sub-contractor, such as a drilling company or laboratory? Should the same types of information for drilling companies and laboratories be provided in the submittal as professional services sub-consultants (e.g., qualifications, letters of intent)?

Please refer to [RFQ/P Questions & Answers](#) (January 25, 2011) for the answers to these questions.

Redevelopment Agency
ebarreiros@sandiego.gov